

Remarks

I. Status of the Application

Claims 1, 3 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dujmenovic (US 6,980,767) in view of Wolkstein (US 5,222,246);

Claims 4-6 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dujmenovic and Wolkstein in view of Satoh (US 6,983,129);

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable under 35 USC § 103(a) over Dujmenovic, Wolkstein and Satoh in view of Sanada (US 6,862,442);

Claims 7, 11, 13 and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dujmenovic in view of Wolkstein (US 5,222,246) and Aggarwal (US 6,985,698);

Claims 14-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dujmenovic, Wolkstein and Aggarwal in view of Satoh; and

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aggarwal in view of Wolkstein.

Claim 1 is now amended to clarify specific aspects of the invention. In particular, claim 1 recites the feature that “the termination port of the phase shift circuit consists of at least a portion of either the in-phase mixer port (I-port), or the quadrature phase mixer port (Q-port).” One embodiment of this arrangement is illustrated in Fig. 3B in which the Q- and I-ports of the phase shifter 334 are provided as differential signal ports, and whereby one side of the differential Q-port operates as the termination port 338. Independent claims 11 and 23 are similarly amended.

Reconsideration of the pending claims 1, 3-11, and 13-23 in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that none of the cited references, either individually or collectively, disclose or suggest the recited combination of features in which "the termination port consists of at least a portion of either the in-phase mixer port (I-port), or the quadrature phase mixer port (Q-port)" as recited in independent claims 1, 11 and 23. Remaining claims are dependent from claims 1, 11 or 23, and each is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

The Applicant submits that the pending claims 1, 3-11, and 13-23 are allowable over the prior art, and accordingly requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowance. Should the Examiner believe an interview would expedite prosecution of the case, a telephone call or e-mail to the Applicants' representative is invited.

Respectfully submitted,



Clifford B. Perry
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 43,854

132 N. El Camino Real, # 347
Encinitas, CA 92024
Tel: (858) 345-5520
Fax: (866) 233-8890
cperry@perryiplaw.com